

**INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

During the interview conducted with Examiner Kim, Applicant's representative and the Examiner discussed the January 13, 2010 Office Action and the references cited therein. Applicant presented a proposed amendment to claim 2, and the Examiner agreed that, should independent claim 2 be amended according to the proposed amendment, it would likely be allowable.

**REMARKS**

Claims 2-21 are pending in the present application and have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Published Patent Application 2003/0050986 (hereinafter "*Matthews*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,249,282 (hereinafter "*Sutcliffe*") in further view of U.S. Patent No. 2004/0064515 (hereinafter "*Hockey*").

Independent claim 2 and independent claim 12 are directed to an apparatus and a method, respectively, for electronic collaboration in an environment including a plurality of communities, each of the plurality of communities having a plurality of live users and at least one community administrator. The remaining claims are dependent either directly or indirectly on either claim 2 or claim 12.

Applicant believes claims 2-21 are patentable over *Matthews* in view of *Sutcliffe* in further view of *Hockey* for at least the reasons set forth in Applicant's prior amendments with regard to *Matthews*, *Sutcliffe*, and *Hockey*, which are hereby incorporated by reference in their entireties for all purposes as if set forth verbatim herein. For instance, *Matthews* does not disclose a profile for a live user where the profile includes descriptive information relating to the live user and including a first data including a first set of attributes of the live user predefined by at least one of the communities and a second data including a second

set of attributes entered by the live user. *Matthews* also does not disclose searching for, or a search engine that searches for, data related to another of the live users based on at least a portion of the second data. Neither *Sutcliffe* nor *Hockey* remedies the deficiencies of *Matthews*. That is, neither *Sutcliffe* nor *Hockey* discloses such a search engine (or searching) based on data included within such a profile.

While *Matthews* states that a group administrator may also have the authority to monitor interaction on message boards and/or to remove inappropriate content, *Matthews* does not disclose a filter that flags communications between users based on a textual portion of the communications according to predetermined criteria established by a monitor prior to release to their intended recipient. Additionally, neither *Sutcliffe* nor *Hockey* discloses such a filter. While *Hockey* discloses a method for monitoring mail messages particularly for virus attacks and unsolicited commercial email ("spam"), it does so by generating a numerical representation (a "digest") for the combined subject line and message content and comparing the resulting digest with existing digests stored in memory. It does not flag communications based on a textual portion of the communications. Additionally, combining the system disclosed in *Hockey* with the one disclosed in *Matthews* would cause both systems to fail for their intended purpose because the filter in *Hockey* would not flag inappropriate content and the monitoring in *Matthews* would not prevent the spread of harmful material.

Although Applicant believes that claims 2-21 are patentable over *Matthews* in view of *Sutcliffe* in further view of *Hockey*, Applicant has amended claims 2 and 12 as proposed during the interview to further differentiate the claimed invention from *Matthews*, *Sutcliffe*, and *Hockey*. Accordingly, claims 2 and 12 call for the first set of attributes of the candidate

user being predefined by at least one of the communities. Claims 2 and 12 further call for a filter monitoring communication between the users that determines whether to allow an intended recipient to receive a communication, block the communication from the intended recipient, or route the communication for further analysis using the first set of attributes. *Matthews, Sutcliffe, and Hockey* (or any combination thereof) do not disclose such a filter. Therefore, claims 2 and 12 are patentable over *Matthews* in view of *Sutcliffe* and in further view of *Hockey* for at least this reason.

Each of the remaining pending claims is dependent upon claim 2 or claim 12, either directly or indirectly, recites additional limitations thereto, and is therefore patentable in its respective combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration by the Examiner and allowance of the present application. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned in an effort to discuss and resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

NELSON MULLINS RILEY & SCARBOROUGH, LLP.

/s/ Jeremy C. Whitley  
Jeremy C. Whitley  
Registration No. 58,775

ip@nelsonmullins.com  
100 North Tryon Street | 42<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28202  
Office: (803) 255-9764  
Fax: (803) 255-9831